

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 18, 20 and 21 remain in this application. Claim 19 has been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. In addition, claims 1, 2, 11, 12 and 21 have been amended.

OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS AND CLAIMS

FIG. 3 of the drawings is objected to due to lack of clarity for the directional line from step 8 to step 9. Accordingly, replacement sheets 1 through 4 are hereby submitted for approval. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to the drawings are respectfully requested.

Claim 2, line 10, is objected to for lack of antecedent basis for "the received authentication key". Claim 12, line 11, is objected to for lack of antecedent basis for "the authorized feature set". Applicants understand this objection to claims 2 and 12 and recognize that similar issues existed with claims 1, 11 and 21. Accordingly, claims 1, 2, 11, 12 and 21 are hereby amended to address this objection. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claims 2 and 12, and approval of the changes to claims 1, 11 and 21, are respectfully requested.

In addition, claim 19, line 2, is objected to for lack of antecedent basis for "the step of generating a local authorization key". Claim 19 is hereby canceled and, therefore, the objection to claim 19 is considered to be moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. In particular, the above Office Action states that it is unclear whether the same or different entity is executing various steps of these method claims. Claims 1 and 2 are hereby amended to more clearly indicate when information is transferred between the communication and authorization devices, so that the operations performed by the respective devices may be more clearly understood. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, rejection to claims 1 and 2 are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 12, 15, 20 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being unpatentable over Manduley (U.S. Patent No. 5,956,505).

Claim 12 provides, *inter alia*, in response to a determination to authorize change in the feature set, using the identification information to generate an authorization key; forming a feature change code from the authorization key and information related to an authorized feature set; and issuing the feature change code. Claim 21 provides, *inter alia*, a means for generating an authorization key using the identification information in response to determining to authorize change in the feature set. Thus, an authorization key is generated using the identification information in response to determining to authorize change in the feature set.

In contrast, the Manduley patent describes a method of a data processing device for remote activation of software features in which a code representing applications and/or features

is generated (step 128) upon user selection of a configuration. The Manduley patent does not describe or suggest generated any type of authorization key, let alone generating an authorization in response to determining to authorize change in a feature set, as required by claims 12 and 21. In fact, determination to activate software features occur in a different device, namely the data center, which is represented by FIGs. 4-A and 4-B and described at col. 7, line 40, through col. 8, line 46. Therefore, claims 12 and 21 distinguish patentably from the Manduley patent

Claims 15 and 20 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 12. Therefore, claims 15 and 20 distinguish patentably from the Manduley patent for the reasons stated above for claim 12.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(b) rejection of claims 12, 15, 20 and 21 are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1 through 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, and 16 through 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manduley, in view of Barkan (U.S. Patent No. 5,864,667). Claims 9 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manduley in view of Barkan and En-Seung, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,892,306).

Independent claims 1, 2 and 11 provide, *inter alia*, an authorization key based on the identification information that is generated by the remote device, a local authorization key based on the same identification information that is generated by the local device, and a comparison of the two keys to determine whether to implement the authorized feature set. In contrast, the

Mandulay patent, the Barkan patent and the En-Seung, et al. patent do not describe or suggest a comparison of two keys based on the same identification information but generated by different entities, as required by claims 1, 2 and 11. Therefore, claims 1, 2 and 11 distinguish patentably from the Manduley patent, the Barkan patent, the En-Seung, et al. patent, and any combination of these patents.

Claim 12 distinguishes from the Manduley patent, the Barkan patent, the En-Seung, et al. patent, and any combination of these patents for the reasons stated for independent claims 1, 2 and 11.

Claims 3 through 10, 13, 14, and 16 through 18 depend from and include all limitations of independent claims 1 and 12. Therefore, claims 3 through 10, 13, 14, and 16 through 18 distinguish patentably from the Manduley patent for the reasons stated above for claims 1 and 11.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 1 through 11, 13, 14, and 16 through 18 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope of any claim, unless Applicants have argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Gasparini, Stephane Christian, et al.

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45
Libertyville, IL 60048

<u>/HISASHI D. WATANABE/</u>	<u>05/21/2007</u>
Hisashi D. Watanabe	Date
Attorney for Applicant(s)	
Registration No. 37,465	
Telephone: (847) 523-2322	
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350	